

Mr. TAYLOR. The Governor did make a very fine statement at Seattle. He recommended one large recreation area, that in this area we would establish a national park smaller than some others had recommended, a national park of about 312,000 acres, a national park to be administered by the Department of the Interior. All of the rest of it is to be administered by the Forest Service. He recommended establishing an advisory board to aid in the planning and development, just as you mentioned.

Now, is that substantially your position?

Mrs. MAY. All those recommendations are embodied in the legislation that I have introduced and is now before your committee.

Mr. TAYLOR. You probably heard Congressman Meeds state a few minutes ago that your bill, or the Governor's bill, would lock up, using his words, more land than his bill would. You mentioned that you would include 1,891,000 acres, while his plan, which he said was the administration's plan, would include only 1,180,000 acres.

Mrs. MAY. Well, here we have in the term "lock up" a definition of the kind of land within here and what we already know about its potential uses. To "lock up" usually infers that this land would have only one use forever. I would rather submit that the feeling of a great many of our people is that the administration's and other approaches would far more freeze, without the flexibility of possibly zeroing in on the best use for certain areas and the "lock up" would refer much more to the administration approach or the Senate approach in that respect than would the Governor's committee's recommendation.

While there is a wider boundary line, there is more flexibility within these boundaries to serve the various needs that the people of our State feel strongly about.

Mr. TAYLOR. In other words, you may be affecting more acres but he locks it up tighter than you do.

Mrs. MAY. Well, let us state that this has been the statement of those who have opposed that approach.

Mr. TAYLOR. Now, how would your bill change the land uses from their present uses under the Forest Service?

Mrs. MAY. Well, it is awfully hard to make just a straight answer. I will have to go through each area.

Mr. TAYLOR. We would be glad to have you do that.

Mrs. MAY. It would be, of course, an addition to the wilderness area but the decisions on the high intensity recreational use would come about after this was set aside. The recommendations of the committee, the Forest Service, and so forth. So you are asking me what would the changes be. I cannot say, because this has been left flexible. We know that the one change that would be made that would be inflexible would be the addition to that acreage that I spoke of into wilderness. But in those recreation areas I would suppose in certain areas what they are doing now, whether it be logging, would be continued. I don't know what the final decisions as to other additional usages might be, whether they might be OK'd, or ruled out.

Mr. TAYLOR. What would be the advantages of operating the area under your bill as compared with continuing its present operation under the National Forest Service?